

# 2021 Inspection Yount, Hyde & Barbour, P.C.

(Headquartered in Winchester, Virginia)

October 20, 2022

THIS IS A PUBLIC VERSION OF A PCAOB INSPECTION REPORT

PORTIONS OF THE COMPLETE REPORT ARE OMITTED FROM THIS DOCUMENT IN ORDER TO COMPLY WITH SECTIONS 104(g)(2) AND 105(b)(5)(A) OF THE SARBANES-OXLEY ACT OF 2002

PCAOB RELEASE NO. 104-2022-254



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

2021 Inspection.....	2
Overview of the 2021 Inspection and Historical Data by Inspection Year .....	3
Part I: Inspection Observations.....	5
Part I.A: Audits with Unsupported Opinions .....	6
Part I.B: Other Instances of Non-Compliance with PCAOB Standards or Rules .....	7
Part II: Observations Related to Quality Control .....	8
Appendix A: Firm’s Response to the Draft Inspection Report.....	A-1

## 2021 INSPECTION

In the 2021 inspection of Yount, Hyde & Barbour, P.C., the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board (PCAOB) assessed the firm's compliance with laws, rules, and professional standards applicable to the audits of public companies.

We selected for review two audits of issuers with fiscal years ending in 2020. For each issuer audit selected, we reviewed a portion of the audit. We also evaluated elements of the firm's system of quality control.

### 2021 Inspection Approach

In selecting issuer audits for review, we use a risk-based method of selection. We make selections based on (1) our internal evaluation of audits we believe have a heightened risk of material misstatement, including those with challenging audit areas, and (2) other risk-based characteristics, including issuer and firm considerations. In certain situations, we may select all of the firm's issuer audits for review.

When we review an audit, we do not review every aspect of the audit. Rather, we generally focus our attention on audit areas we believe to be of greater complexity, areas of greater significance or with a heightened risk of material misstatement to the issuer's financial statements, and areas of recurring deficiencies. We may also select some audit areas for review in a manner designed to incorporate unpredictability.

Our selection of audits for review does not necessarily constitute a representative sample of the firm's total population of issuer audits. Additionally, our inspection findings are specific to the particular portions of the issuer audits reviewed. They are not an assessment of all of the firm's audit work nor of all of the audit procedures performed for the audits reviewed.

View the details on the [scope of our inspections and our inspections procedures](#).

# OVERVIEW OF THE 2021 INSPECTION AND HISTORICAL DATA BY INSPECTION YEAR

The following information provides an overview of our 2021 inspection as well as data from the previous inspection. We use a risk-based method to select audits for review and to identify areas on which we focus our review. Because our inspection process evolves over time, it can, and often does, focus on a different mix of audits and audit areas from inspection to inspection and firm to firm. Further, a firm's business, the applicable auditing standards, or other factors can change from the time of one inspection to the next. As a result of these variations, we caution that our inspection results are not necessarily comparable over time or among firms.

## Firm Data and Audits Selected for Review

	2021	2018
<b>Firm data</b>		
<b>Total issuer audit clients for which the firm was the principal auditor at the outset of the inspection procedures</b>	22	17
<b>Total engagement partners on issuer audit work<sup>1</sup></b>	8	6
<b>Audits reviewed</b>		
<b>Total audits reviewed<sup>2</sup></b>	2	3
<b>Audits in which the firm was the principal auditor</b>	2	3
<b>Integrated audits of financial statements and internal control over financial reporting (ICFR)</b>	2	3
<b>Audits with Part I.A deficiencies</b>	1	0

If we include a deficiency in Part I.A of our report, it does not necessarily mean that the firm has not addressed the deficiency. In many cases, the firm has performed remedial actions after the deficiency was identified. Depending on the circumstances, remedial actions may include performing additional audit procedures, informing management of the issuer of the need for changes to the financial statements or reporting on ICFR, or taking steps to prevent reliance on prior audit reports.

<sup>1</sup> The number of engagement partners on issuer audit work represents the total number of firm personnel (not necessarily limited to personnel with an ownership interest) who had primary responsibility for an issuer audit (as defined in AS 1201, *Supervision of the Audit Engagement*) during the twelve-month period preceding the outset of the inspection.

<sup>2</sup> The population of issuer audits from which audits are selected for review may differ from the issuer audits at the outset of the inspection procedures due to variations such as new issuer audit clients for which the firm has not yet issued an audit report or issuer audit clients lost prior to the outset of the inspection.

Our inspection may include a review, on a sample basis, of the adequacy of a firm's remedial actions, either with respect to previously identified deficiencies or deficiencies identified during the current inspection. If a firm does not take appropriate actions to address deficiencies, we may criticize its system of quality control or pursue a disciplinary action.

If we include a deficiency in our report — other than those deficiencies for audits with incorrect opinions on the financial statements and/or ICFR — it does not necessarily mean that the issuer's financial statements are materially misstated or that undisclosed material weaknesses in ICFR exist. It is often not possible for us to reach a conclusion on those points based on our inspection procedures and related findings because, for example, we have only the information that the auditor retained and the issuer's public disclosures. We do not have direct access to the issuer's management, underlying books and records, and other information.

## Audit Areas Most Frequently Reviewed

This table reflects the audit areas we have selected most frequently for review in the 2021 inspection and the previous inspection. For the issuer audits selected for review, we selected these areas because they were generally significant to the issuer's financial statements, may have included complex issues for auditors, and/or involved complex judgments in (1) estimating and auditing the reported value of related accounts and disclosures and (2) implementing and auditing the related controls.

2021		2018	
Audit area	Audits reviewed	Audit area	Audits reviewed
Allowance for loan losses	2	Allowance for loan losses	3
Deposits	1	Investment securities	2
Business combinations	1	Business combinations	1

# PART I: INSPECTION OBSERVATIONS

Part I.A of our report discusses deficiencies, if any, that were of such significance that we believe the firm, at the time it issued its audit report(s), had not obtained sufficient appropriate audit evidence to support its opinion on the issuer's financial statements and/or ICFR.

Part I.B discusses deficiencies, if any, that do not relate directly to the sufficiency or appropriateness of evidence the firm obtained to support its opinion(s) but nevertheless relate to instances of non-compliance with PCAOB standards or rules.

Consistent with the Sarbanes-Oxley Act ("Act"), it is the Board's assessment that nothing in Part I of this report deals with a criticism of, or potential defect in, the firm's quality control system. We discuss any such criticisms or potential defects in Part II. Further, you should not infer from any Part I deficiency, or combination of deficiencies, that we identified a quality control finding in Part II. Section 104(g)(2) of the Act restricts us from publicly disclosing Part II deficiencies unless the firm does not address the criticisms or potential defects to the Board's satisfaction no later than 12 months after the issuance of this report.

## Classification of Audits with Part I.A Deficiencies

Within Part I.A of this report, we classify each issuer audit in one of the categories discussed below based on the Part I.A deficiency or deficiencies identified in our review.

The purpose of this classification system is to group and present issuer audits by the number of Part I.A deficiencies we identified within the audit as well as to highlight audits with an incorrect opinion on the financial statements and/or ICFR.

### Audits with an Incorrect Opinion on the Financial Statements and/or ICFR

This classification includes instances where a deficiency was identified in connection with our inspection and, as a result, an issuer's financial statements were determined to be materially misstated, and the issuer restated its financial statements. It also includes instances where a deficiency was identified in connection with our inspection and, as a result, an issuer's ICFR was determined to be ineffective, or there were additional material weaknesses that the firm did not identify, and the firm withdrew its opinion, or revised its report, on ICFR. This classification does not include instances where, unrelated to our review, an issuer restated its financial statements and/or an issuer's ICFR was determined to be ineffective. We include any deficiencies identified in connection with our reviews of these audits in the audits with multiple deficiencies or audits with a single deficiency classification below.

### Audits with Multiple Deficiencies

This classification includes instances where multiple deficiencies were identified that related to a combination of one or more financial statement accounts, disclosures, and/or important controls in an ICFR audit.

## Audits with a Single Deficiency

This classification includes instances where a single deficiency was identified that related to a financial statement account or disclosure or to an important control in an ICFR audit.

## PART I.A: AUDITS WITH UNSUPPORTED OPINIONS

This section of our report discusses the deficiencies identified, by specific issuer audit reviewed, in the audit work supporting the firm's opinion on the issuer's financial statements and/or ICFR.

We identify each issuer by a letter (e.g., Issuer A) and industry sector. Each deficiency could relate to several auditing standards, but we reference the PCAOB standard(s) that most directly relates to the requirement with which the firm did not comply.

We present issuer audits below within their respective deficiency classifications (as discussed previously). Within the classifications, we generally present the audits based on our assessment as to the relative significance of the identified deficiencies, taking into account the significance of the financial statement accounts and/or disclosures affected, and/or the nature or extent of the deficiencies.

### Audits with an Incorrect Opinion on the Financial Statements and/or ICFR

None

### Audits with Multiple Deficiencies

#### Issuer A – Financials

##### Type of audit and related area affected

In our review, we identified deficiencies in the financial statement and ICFR audits related to the **Allowance for Loan Losses (ALL)**.

##### Description of the deficiencies identified

The issuer's general reserve component of the ALL included a qualitative reserve component. In determining the qualitative reserve component, the issuer used loan risk grades and basis point adjustments for qualitative factors. The following deficiencies were identified:

- The firm identified and tested a control over the review of loan risk grades for loans that met certain criteria. The firm did not identify and test any controls over the review of loan risk grades for loans that did not meet the criteria. (AS 2201.39)

- The firm selected for testing a control that included the issuer's review of certain loans for potential impairment. The firm did not evaluate the specific review procedures that the control owners performed to review the loans for potential impairment. (AS 2201.42 and .44)
- The firm selected for testing a control that consisted of the issuer's review of the ALL, including an evaluation of the qualitative reserve component. The firm did not evaluate the specific review procedures that the control owners performed to evaluate the reasonableness of the basis points for certain qualitative factors used to determine the qualitative reserve component. (AS 2201.42 and .44)
- The firm did not identify and test any controls over the accuracy of a system-generated report used in the operation of a control. (AS 2201.39)
- The firm's approach for substantively testing the ALL was to review and test management's process. With respect to certain qualitative components of the ALL, the firm did not evaluate whether the issuer had a reasonable basis for the basis points used and for its selection of basis points from a range of potential basis points. (AS 2501.16)
- The sample size the firm used in its substantive procedures to test the reasonableness of loan risk grades was too small to provide sufficient appropriate audit evidence because these procedures were designed based on a level of control reliance that was not supported due to the deficiencies in the firm's control testing discussed above. (AS 2301.16, .18, and .37; AS 2315.19, .23, and .23A)

## Audits with a Single Deficiency

None

## PART I.B: OTHER INSTANCES OF NON-COMPLIANCE WITH PCAOB STANDARDS OR RULES

In the 2021 inspection, we did not identify any deficiencies related to other instances of non-compliance with PCAOB standards or rules.



## PART II: OBSERVATIONS RELATED TO QUALITY CONTROL

Part II of our report discusses criticisms of, and potential defects in, the firm's system of quality control.

We include deficiencies in Part II if an analysis of the inspection results, including the results of the reviews of individual audits, indicates that the firm's system of quality control does not provide reasonable assurance that firm personnel will comply with applicable professional standards and requirements. Generally, the report's description of quality control criticisms is based on observations from our inspection procedures.

This report does not reflect changes or improvements to the firm's system of quality control that the firm may have made subsequent to the period covered by our inspection. The Board does consider such changes or improvements in assessing whether the firm has satisfactorily addressed the quality control criticisms or defects no later than 12 months after the issuance of this report.

When we issue our reports, we do not make public criticisms of, and potential defects in, the firm's system of quality control, to the extent any are identified. If a firm does not address to the Board's satisfaction any criticism of, or potential defect in, the firm's system of quality control within 12 months after the issuance of our report, we will make public any such deficiency.

## APPENDIX A: FIRM'S RESPONSE TO THE DRAFT INSPECTION REPORT

Pursuant to Section 104(f) of the Act, 15 U.S.C. § 7214(f), and PCAOB Rule 4007(a), the firm provided a written response to a draft of this report. Pursuant to Section 104(f) of the Act and PCAOB Rule 4007(b), the firm's response, excluding any portion granted confidential treatment, is attached hereto and made part of this final inspection report.

The Board does not make public any of a firm's comments that address a nonpublic portion of the report unless a firm specifically requests otherwise. In some cases, the result may be that none of a firm's response is made publicly available.

In addition, pursuant to Section 104(f) of the Act, 15 U.S.C. § 7214(f), and PCAOB Rule 4007(b), if a firm requests, and the Board grants, confidential treatment for any of the firm's comments on a draft report, the Board does not include those comments in the final report. The Board routinely grants confidential treatment, if requested, for any portion of a firm's response that addresses any point in the draft that the Board omits from, or any inaccurate statement in the draft that the Board corrects in, the final report.



50 S. Cameron St.  
Winchester, VA 22601  
540.662.3417  
YHBcpa.com



August 2, 2022

Mr. George Botic, Director  
Division of Registration and Inspections  
Public Company Accounting Oversight Board  
1666 K Street NW  
Washington, DC 20006

Re: Response to Part I of the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board Draft Report on  
2021 Inspection of Yount, Hyde & Barbour, P.C.

Dear Mr. Botic,

We are pleased to provide our response to Part I of the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board (PCAOB) Draft Report on the 2021 Inspection of Yount, Hyde & Barbour, P.C. dated July 21, 2022 (Draft Report).

We have evaluated the matters described in Part I of the Draft Report and have taken appropriate actions to address the findings in accordance with PCAOB rules and auditing standards and our policies.

We support the PCAOB inspection process. We are committed to using the process to improve our system of quality control and assist in our understanding of the PCAOB's expectations in subjective audit areas such as internal control over financial reporting.

We appreciate the opportunity to provide our response to the Draft Report and continue discussions regarding our shared goal of audit quality.

Sincerely,

*Yount, Hyde & Barbour, P.C.*

*Dedicated to Trust and Excellence.*

